

Superfield approach to Jackiw-Pi model of 3D massive non-Abelian gauge theory

S. Gupta^{(a),*} R. Kumar^{(a),†} and R. P. Malik^{(a,b)‡}

^(a)*Physics Department, Centre of Advanced Studies,*

Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi - 221 005, India

^(b)*DST Centre for Interdisciplinary Mathematical Sciences,*

Faculty of Science, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi - 221 005, India

In the available literature, only the Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST) symmetries are known for the Jackiw-Pi model of three $(2 + 1)$ -dimensional (3D) massive non-Abelian gauge theory. We derive the full set of off-shell nilpotent ($s_{(a)b}^2 = 0$) and absolutely anticommuting ($s_b s_{ab} + s_{ab} s_b = 0$) (anti-)BRST transformations $s_{(a)b}$ corresponding to the *usual* Yang-Mills gauge transformations of this model by exploiting the “augmented” superfield formalism where the horizontality condition and gauge invariant restrictions blend together in a meaningful manner. This superfield formalism leads to the derivation of (anti-)BRST invariant Curci-Ferrari restriction which plays a key role in the proof of absolute anticommutativity of $s_{(a)b}$. A novel feature of our present investigation is the derivation of (anti-)BRST transformations for the auxiliary field ρ from our superfield formalism which is *neither* generated by the (anti-)BRST charges *nor* obtained from the requirements of nilpotency and/or absolute anticommutativity of the (anti-)BRST symmetries of our 3D gauge theory.

PACS : 11.15.-q, 03.70.+k, 11.10.Kk, 12.90.+b

Keywords: Jackiw-Pi model; 3D massive gauge theory; superfield formalism; (anti-)BRST symmetries; nilpotency and absolute anticommutativity; Curci-Ferrari condition

*Electronic address: guptasaurabh4u@gmail.com

†Electronic address: raviphynuc@gmail.com

‡Electronic address: malik@bhu.ac.in

I. INTRODUCTION

The (non-)Abelian 1-form gauge theories in 4D are at the heart of standard model (SM) of particle physics where there is a stunning degree of agreement between theory and experiment. One of the weak links of SM is connected with the very existence of esoteric Higgs particles which are responsible for the mass generation of gauge bosons and fermions. In view of the fact that Higgs particles have not yet been observed experimentally, other theoretical tools for the mass generation of gauge bosons (in various dimensions of spacetime) have been proposed and they have generated a renewed interest in theoretical physics.

In the context of the above, it may be mentioned that the 4D topologically massive (non-)Abelian gauge theories have been studied in the past [1–4] where there is merging of 1-form and 2-form (non-)Abelian gauge fields through the celebrated topological $B \wedge F$ term. In such models, it has been shown that the (non-)Abelian 1-form gauge fields acquire a mass in a very natural fashion without taking any recourse to the Higgs mechanism. However, these models suffer from problems connected with renormalizability, consistency and unitarity. We have studied [5–10] these models, within the frameworks of superfield and Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST) formalisms in the hope that we would be able to propose a model that would be free of the drawbacks of earlier models [1–4]. However, it remains still an open problem to construct a 4D consistent, unitary and renormalizable non-Abelian 2-form gauge theory (which incorporates a 1-form gauge field, as well).

In the above scenario, it is an interesting idea to propose and study some lower dimensional models which are free of the problems of 4D topologically massive gauge theory and where mass and gauge-invariance co-exist together. One such *massive* model, that has been a topic of theoretical research, is the Jackiw-Pi (JP) model in three $(2 + 1)$ -dimensions of spacetime where the non-Abelian gauge invariance and parity are respected together due to the introduction a 1-form vector field, endowed with a parity, that is opposite of the usual non-Abelian 1-form vector field [11]. In fact, the 3D gauge theories, in general, have been a topic of theoretical interest in the recent past because of the novel and attractive features associated with them (see, e.g. [12, 13] for details). Furthermore, it has already been shown that, for sufficiently strong vector coupling, the gauge invariance does *not* necessarily imply the masslessness of gauge particles [14, 15]. Thus, the massive gauge theories are allowed.

In view of the above statements, the JP model of 3D massive gauge theory has been

studied from different theoretical angles. For instance, the Hamiltonian formulation and its constraint analysis have been carried out in [16]. The JP model is also endowed with some interesting continuous symmetries. In this context, mention can be made of the usual Yang-Mills (YM) symmetry transformations and a symmetry that is different from the YM. The BRST symmetry and Slavnov-Taylor identity of this model have also been obtained [17]. However, the *proper* anti-BRST symmetry of this model has not been discussed in [17].

The main motivation behind our present investigation is to derive the full set of nilpotent ($s_{(a)b}^2 = 0$) and absolutely anticommuting ($s_b s_{ab} + s_{ab} s_b = 0$) (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations $s_{(a)b}$ corresponding to the usual YM gauge symmetry transformations for the JP model by exploiting the “augmented” superfield approach to BRST formalism [18–22]. This geometrical approach (see, e.g. [18, 19]) leads to the derivation of Curci-Ferrari condition [23] which ensures the absolute anticommutativity of $s_{(a)b}$. Thus, the (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations, that are derived using the above superfield formalism, satisfy the key requirements of the BRST formalism which are very sacrosanct.

There are a couple of novel observations in our present investigation. First, we are theoretically compelled to go beyond the horizontality condition (HC) to invoke appropriate gauge-invariant restrictions (GIRs) for the derivation of the full set of (anti-)BRST symmetries. Second, our superfield formalism leads to the derivation of (anti-)BRST symmetries for the auxiliary field ρ which cannot be derived *either* from the (anti-)BRST charges *or* from the requirements of nilpotency and absolute anticommutativity of our theory. Thus, our superfield formalism, in a very definite manner, adds a few new glittering feathers in the already shining cap of the usefulness of the BRST approach to gauge theories.

The prime factors that are responsible for our present investigations are as follows. First, the JP model is free of the problems encountered in the 4D topologically massive models with $B \wedge F$ term. Second, this 3D model does not invoke any higher form gauge field (like the 2-form B field of 4D theory) for the mass generation. Third, the understanding of this 3D theory might provide some insights that would show us the correct path to construct a renormalizable and consistent 4D massive gauge theory. Fourth, we study JP model within the framework of BRST formalism where the renormalizability and unitarity could be proven with the help of Slavnov-Taylor identities and the nilpotency of the BRST charge. Finally, the 3D JP model is a very special model because it generates mass for the gauge field without violating the parity symmetry. This feature is drastically different from the mass generation

by incorporating the Chern-Simons term in the Lagrangian density of a 3D gauge theory.

The contents of our present investigation are organized as follows. In Sec. II, we discuss two sets of local gauge symmetry transformations associated with the JP model. Our Sec. III incorporates the derivation of (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations for the gauge field (A_μ) and (anti-)ghost fields ($(\bar{C})C$) with the help of Bonora-Tonin's superfield formalism [18, 19]. In Sec. IV, we deal with the derivation of (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations for the vector field ϕ_μ and scalar field ρ within the framework of “augmented” superfield formalism [20–22]. Our Sec. V is fully devoted to the derivation of coupled Lagrangian densities that respect the above (anti-)BRST transformations. We show the conservation of (anti-)BRST currents (and corresponding charges) in Sec. VI. Our Sec. VII contains the discussion of ghost symmetry transformations and the derivation of the algebra satisfied by *all* the symmetry generators. Finally, we made a few concluding remarks in Sec. VIII.

In our Appendix, we capture the nilpotency and anticommutativity of the (anti-)BRST charges, the (anti-)BRST invariance and equivalence of the coupled Lagrangian densities within the framework of “augmented” superfield formalism.

Conventions and Notations: We adopt here the conventions and notations such that the background spacetime Minkowskian flat metric has the signature $(+1, -1, -1)$, totally antisymmetric Levi-Civita tensor $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\eta}$ satisfies $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\eta} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\eta} = -3!$, $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\eta} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\kappa} = -2! \delta_\eta^\kappa$, etc., and $\varepsilon_{012} = +1 = -\varepsilon^{012}$. In the above, the Greek indices $\mu, \nu, \eta \dots = 0, 1, 2$ correspond to the 3D time and space directions. We take the dot and cross products $P \cdot Q = P^a Q^a$, $P \times Q = f^{abc} P^a Q^b T^c$ in the $SU(N)$ Lie algebraic space where the generators T^a of the $SU(N)$ Lie algebra satisfy the commutator $[T^a, T^b] = i f^{abc} T^c$ with $a, b, c \dots = 1, 2, 3 \dots N^2 - 1$. The structure constants f^{abc} are chosen to be totally antisymmetric in a, b, c [24].

II. PRELIMINARIES: CONTINUOUS LOCAL GAUGE SYMMETRIES

We begin with the Lagrangian density of the three $(2 + 1)$ -dimensional (3D) *massive* non-Abelian 1-form gauge theory proposed by JP where the $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills (YM) gauge invariance and parity are respected *together*. Furthermore, this theory respects a non-Yang-Mills gauge symmetry transformation as well. The Lagrangian density of the theory, in its full blaze of glory, is (see, e.g. [11])

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = -\frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu} \cdot F_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4} (G^{\mu\nu} + g F^{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \cdot (G_{\mu\nu} + g F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho) + \frac{m}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\eta} F_{\mu\nu} \cdot \phi_\eta, \quad (1)$$

where A_μ and ϕ_μ are the vector fields with opposite parity, ρ is a scalar field, g is a coupling constant and m is the mass parameter. The 2-form $(F^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2!}(dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu)F_{\mu\nu} \cdot T)$ curvature tensor $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu - g (A_\mu \times A_\nu)$, corresponding to the 1-form $(A^{(1)} = dx^\mu A_\mu \cdot T)$ field A_μ , is derived from the Maurer-Cartan equation $F^{(2)} = dA^{(1)} + ig (A^{(1)} \wedge A^{(1)})$. Similarly, the field strength tensor $G_{\mu\nu} = D_\mu \phi_\nu - D_\nu \phi_\mu$, corresponding to the 1-form $(\phi^{(1)} = dx^\mu \phi_\mu \cdot T)$ field ϕ_μ , is obtained from $G^{(2)} = d\phi^{(1)} + ig [\phi^{(1)} \wedge A^{(1)} + A^{(1)} \wedge \phi^{(1)}] \equiv \frac{1}{2!}(dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu)G_{\mu\nu} \cdot T$ where the covariant derivative is defined as: $D_\mu \phi_\nu = \partial_\mu \phi_\nu - g (A_\mu \times \phi_\nu)$.

The above Lagrangian density (1) respects the following usual local Yang-Mills (YM) gauge transformations δ_1 , as listed below:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_1 A_\mu &= D_\mu \Lambda, & \delta_1 \phi_\mu &= -g (\phi_\mu \times \Lambda), & \delta_1 \rho &= -g (\rho \times \Lambda), \\ \delta_1 F_{\mu\nu} &= -g (F_{\mu\nu} \times \Lambda), & \delta_1 G_{\mu\nu} &= -g (G_{\mu\nu} \times \Lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

This theory also respects a non-Yang-Mills (NYM) gauge transformation δ_2 . The infinitesimal version of this transformation is:

$$\delta_2 A_\mu = 0, \quad \delta_2 \phi_\mu = D_\mu \Omega, \quad \delta_2 \rho = +\Omega, \quad \delta_2 F_{\mu\nu} = 0. \quad (3)$$

In the above, $\Lambda = \Lambda \cdot T \equiv \Lambda^a T^a$ and $\Omega = \Omega \cdot T \equiv \Omega^a T^a$ are the $SU(N)$ valued infinitesimal Lorentz scalar gauge parameters. It is straightforward to check that the Lagrangian density (1) transforms, under the local, continuous and infinitesimal transformations (2) and (3), as

$$\delta_1 \mathcal{L}_0 = 0, \quad \delta_2 \mathcal{L}_0 = \partial_\mu \left[\frac{m}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\eta} F_{\nu\eta} \cdot \Omega \right]. \quad (4)$$

It is clear that the usual YM symmetry is a perfect symmetry for $\mathcal{L}_0$ because $\delta_1 \mathcal{L}_0 = 0$. However, the Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}_0$ remains quasi-invariant under δ_2 because it transforms to a total spacetime derivative.

In our present investigation, we shall focus on the *usual* YM gauge symmetry transformations (δ_1) and derive the corresponding (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations that are off-shell nilpotent and absolutely anticommuting in nature. As a consequence, these transformations would be *proper* because they fulfill the basic tenets of BRST formalism.

III. (ANTI-)BRST SYMMETRIES OF GAUGE AND (ANTI-)GHOST FIELDS: BONORA-TONIN'S SUPERFIELD FORMALISM

We apply the well-known Bonora-Tonin's superfield approach [18, 19] to derive the nilpotent (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations corresponding to the YM gauge transformations (δ_1) for the 1-form gauge field A_μ and (anti-)ghost fields $(\bar{C})C$. In this approach, first of all, we generalize the 3D bosonic vector field ($A_\mu = A_\mu \cdot T$) and fermionic (anti-)ghost fields ($\bar{C} = \bar{C} \cdot T$, $C = C \cdot T$) to their corresponding superfields. The latter are defined on the $(3, 2)$ -dimensional supermanifold parametrized by the superspace variables $Z^M = (x^\mu, \theta, \bar{\theta})$ where x^μ ($\mu = 0, 1, 2$) are the spacetime variables and $(\theta, \bar{\theta})$ are the Grassmannian variables (with $\theta^2 = \bar{\theta}^2 = 0$, $\theta\bar{\theta} + \bar{\theta}\theta = 0$). These superfields can be expanded along the directions of the Grassmannian directions θ and $\bar{\theta}$ (of the $(3, 2)$ -dimensional supermanifold), as [18, 19];

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{B}_\mu(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= A_\mu(x) + \theta \bar{R}_\mu(x) + \bar{\theta} R_\mu(x) + i \theta \bar{\theta} S_\mu(x), \\ \tilde{F}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= C(x) + i \theta \bar{B}_1(x) + i \bar{\theta} B_1(x) + i \theta \bar{\theta} s(x), \\ \tilde{\bar{F}}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= \bar{C}(x) + i \theta \bar{B}_2(x) + i \bar{\theta} B_2(x) + i \theta \bar{\theta} \bar{s}(x),\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

where the local secondary fields $(R_\mu(x), \bar{R}_\mu(x), s(x), \bar{s}(x))$ are fermionic ($s^2 = \bar{s}^2 = 0$, etc.) and $(S_\mu(x), B_1(x), \bar{B}_1(x), B_2(x), \bar{B}_2(x))$ are bosonic in nature. These secondary fields can be determined in terms of the basic and auxiliary fields of the 3D local BRST invariant quantum field theory through the application of the celebrated horizontality condition (HC).

It is to be noted that the kinetic term $(-\frac{1}{4}F^{\mu\nu} \cdot F_{\mu\nu})$, corresponding to the 1-form gauge field A_μ , remains invariant under the gauge transformations (2). The HC condition implies that the gauge invariant kinetic term remains invariant when we generalize the 3D ordinary non-Abelian gauge theory onto $(3, 2)$ -dimensional supermanifold. The above statement of the gauge invariance can be, mathematically, expressed as:

$$-\frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu} \cdot F_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{4} \tilde{F}^{MN} \cdot \tilde{F}_{MN},\tag{6}$$

where the super curvature $\tilde{F}^{MN}$, defined on the $(3, 2)$ -dimensional supermanifold, is derived from the Maurer-Cartan equation: $\tilde{F}^{(2)} = \tilde{d}\tilde{A}^{(1)} + ig (\tilde{A}^{(1)} \wedge \tilde{A}^{(1)}) \equiv \frac{1}{2!}(dZ^M \wedge dZ^N)\tilde{F}_{MN}$. Here $\tilde{d}$ is the super exterior derivative and $\tilde{A}^{(1)}$ is the super 1-form connection which are the generalizations of the ordinary exterior derivative d and 1-form connection $A^{(1)}$ as

$$d \longrightarrow \tilde{d} = dZ^M \partial_M \equiv dx^\mu \partial_\mu + d\theta \partial_\theta + d\bar{\theta} \partial_{\bar{\theta}},$$

$$A^{(1)} \longrightarrow \tilde{A}^{(1)} = dZ^M \tilde{A}_M \equiv dx^\mu \tilde{B}_\mu(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) + d\theta \tilde{F}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) + d\bar{\theta} \tilde{F}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}), \quad (7)$$

where $\tilde{B}_\mu(x, \theta, \bar{\theta})$, $\tilde{F}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta})$ and $\tilde{F}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta})$ are the superfields on the (3, 2)-dimensional supermanifold and $\partial_M = (\partial_\mu, \partial_\theta, \partial_{\bar{\theta}})$. The celebrated HC condition (6) leads to the following relationships amongst the basic, auxiliary and secondary fields of the theory [18–22]

$$\begin{aligned} R_\mu &= D_\mu C, \quad \bar{R}_\mu = D_\mu \bar{C}, \quad B_1 = -\frac{i}{2} g (C \times C), \quad \bar{B}_2 = -\frac{i}{2} g (\bar{C} \times \bar{C}), \\ S_\mu &= D_\mu B + ig (D_\mu C \times \bar{C}) \equiv -D_\mu \bar{B} - ig (D_\mu \bar{C} \times C), \\ s &= -g (\bar{B} \times C), \quad \bar{s} = +g (B \times \bar{C}), \quad B + \bar{B} = -ig (C \times \bar{C}). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where we have made the choices $\bar{B}_1 = \bar{B}$ and $B_2 = B$ which are, finally, identified with the Nakanishi-Lautrup type auxiliary fields of the 3D local quantum field theory.

It is to be noted that, to satisfy the HC (6), one sets equal to zero the Grassmannian components of the super tensor $\tilde{F}_{MN}$ in super 2-form $\tilde{F}^{(2)} = (\frac{dZ^M \wedge dZ^N}{2!}) \tilde{F}_{MN}$. The equation $\bar{B} + B = -ig (C \times \bar{C})$ (that is quoted in (8)) is the Curci-Ferrari (CF) restriction which is one of the key *hallmarks* of the non-Abelian 1-form gauge theory. This condition is derived from HC when one sets equal to zero the $\tilde{F}_{\theta\bar{\theta}}$ component of the super curvature tensor $\tilde{F}_{MN}$. The CF condition plays an important role in providing the proof for the absolute anticommutativity of the (anti-)BRST transformations. Furthermore, the CF condition is instrumental in obtaining a coupled set of Lagrangian densities (cf. (30), (31) below) that respect the (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations.

Substituting the above relationships (8) into the super-expansions of the superfields (cf. (5)), we obtain the following explicit expansions:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_\mu^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= A_\mu(x) + \theta D_\mu \bar{C}(x) + \bar{\theta} D_\mu C(x) + \theta \bar{\theta} [iD_\mu B - g (D_\mu C \times \bar{C})](x) \\ &\equiv A_\mu(x) + \theta (s_{ab} A_\mu(x)) + \bar{\theta} (s_b A_\mu(x)) + \theta \bar{\theta} (s_b s_{ab} A_\mu(x)), \\ \tilde{F}^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= C(x) + \theta (i\bar{B}(x)) + \bar{\theta} \left[\frac{g}{2} (C \times C)(x) \right] + \theta \bar{\theta} [-ig (\bar{B} \times C)(x)] \\ &\equiv C(x) + \theta (s_{ab} C(x)) + \bar{\theta} (s_b C(x)) + \theta \bar{\theta} (s_b s_{ab} C(x)), \\ \tilde{\bar{F}}^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= \bar{C}(x) + \theta \left[\frac{g}{2} (\bar{C} \times \bar{C})(x) \right] + \bar{\theta} (iB(x)) + \theta \bar{\theta} [(+ig (B \times \bar{C}))(x)] \\ &\equiv \bar{C}(x) + \theta (s_{ab} \bar{C}(x)) + \bar{\theta} (s_b \bar{C}(x)) + \theta \bar{\theta} (s_b s_{ab} \bar{C}(x)), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where (h), as the superscript on the superfields, denotes the expansions of the superfields after the application of HC. The super 2-form curvature tensor can be expressed as [18–22]

$$\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = F_{\mu\nu}(x) - \theta [g (F_{\mu\nu} \times \bar{C})](x) - \bar{\theta} [g (F_{\mu\nu} \times C)](x)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \theta \bar{\theta} [g^2 (F_{\mu\nu} \times C) \times \bar{C} - ig (F_{\mu\nu} \times B)](x) \\
& \equiv F_{\mu\nu}(x) + \theta (s_{ab} F_{\mu\nu}(x)) + \bar{\theta} (s_b F_{\mu\nu}(x)) + \theta \bar{\theta} (s_b s_{ab} F_{\mu\nu}(x)). \quad (10)
\end{aligned}$$

It is clear from the above expressions that the kinetic term of A_μ (i.e. $-\frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu} \cdot F_{\mu\nu}$) remains invariant (i.e. independent of the Grassmann variables $\theta, \bar{\theta}$) under the application of HC. In other words, we obtain $-\frac{1}{4} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \cdot \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = -\frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu}(x) \cdot F_{\mu\nu}(x)$. Before we wrap up this section, we would like to state that the equations (9) and (10) imply that: $s_b \longleftrightarrow \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} (\partial/\partial \bar{\theta})$, $s_{ab} \longleftrightarrow \lim_{\bar{\theta} \rightarrow 0} (\partial/\partial \theta)$. This mapping establishes a relationship between the (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations and the translational generators along the Grassmannian directions of the (3, 2)-dimensional supermanifold. This key relationship entails upon the (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations, emerging from our superfield formalism, to be *always* nilpotent of order two ($s_{(a)b}^2 = 0$) and absolutely anticommuting in nature because of the fact that $(\partial_\theta)^2 = (\partial_{\bar{\theta}})^2 = 0$ and $\partial_\theta \partial_{\bar{\theta}} + \partial_{\bar{\theta}} \partial_\theta = 0$.

IV. (ANTI-)BRST SYMMETRIES FOR THE VECTOR FIELD (ϕ_μ) AND SCALAR FIELD (ρ) : AUGMENTED SUPERFIELD FORMALISM

It can be checked that the composite fields $(F_{\mu\nu} \cdot \phi_\eta)$ and $(F_{\mu\nu} \cdot \rho)$ remain invariant under the usual YM gauge transformations (δ_1) because

$$\delta_1(F_{\mu\nu} \cdot \phi_\eta) = 0, \quad \delta_1(F_{\mu\nu} \cdot \rho) = 0. \quad (11)$$

Since $(F_{\mu\nu} \cdot \phi_\eta)$ and $(F_{\mu\nu} \cdot \rho)$ are the gauge invariant quantities, therefore, these are physical quantities (in some sense). These quantities must remain unaffected by the presence of the Grassmannian variables when the former entities are generalized onto the (3, 2)-dimensional supermanifold. Thus, we have the following gauge invariant restrictions (GIRs):

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \cdot \tilde{\phi}_\eta(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= F_{\mu\nu}(x) \cdot \phi_\eta(x), \\
\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \cdot \tilde{\rho}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= F_{\mu\nu}(x) \cdot \rho(x). \quad (12)
\end{aligned}$$

In the above, the expansion for $\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta})$ is quoted in equation (10). The bosonic superfields $\tilde{\phi}_\mu(x, \theta, \bar{\theta})$ and $\tilde{\rho}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta})$ can be, in general, expanded on the (3, 2)-dimensional supermanifold along the Grassmannian directions $(\theta, \bar{\theta})$, as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\phi}_\mu(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= \phi_\mu(x) + \theta \bar{P}_\mu(x) + \bar{\theta} P_\mu(x) + i \theta \bar{\theta} Q_\mu(x), \\
\tilde{\rho}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= \rho(x) + \theta \bar{P}(x) + \bar{\theta} P(x) + i \theta \bar{\theta} Q(x), \quad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

where the secondary fields $(P_\mu, \bar{P}_\mu, P, \bar{P})$ are fermionic and (Q_μ, Q) are bosonic in nature. These secondary fields can be determined with the help of GIRs (cf. (12)). In fact, the equality (12), leads to the following relationships

$$\begin{aligned} P_\mu &= -g (\phi_\mu \times C), \quad P = -g (\rho \times C), \quad Q_\mu = -i[g^2 (\phi_\mu \times C) \times \bar{C} - ig (\phi_\mu \times B)], \\ \bar{P}_\mu &= -g (\phi_\mu \times \bar{C}), \quad \bar{P} = -g (\rho \times \bar{C}), \quad Q = -i[g^2 (\rho \times C) \times \bar{C} - ig (\rho \times B)]. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Substituting the above values into (13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\phi}_\mu^{(g)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= \phi_\mu(x) - \theta [g (\phi_\mu \times \bar{C})](x) - \bar{\theta} [g (\phi_\mu \times C)](x) \\ &\quad + \theta \bar{\theta} [g^2 (\phi_\mu \times C) \times \bar{C} - ig (\phi_\mu \times B)](x) \\ &\equiv \phi_\mu(x) + \theta (s_{ab} \phi_\mu(x)) + \bar{\theta} (s_b \phi_\mu(x)) + \theta \bar{\theta} (s_b s_{ab} \phi_\mu(x)), \\ \tilde{\rho}^{(g)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= \rho(x) - \theta [g (\rho \times \bar{C})](x) - \bar{\theta} [g (\rho \times C)](x) \\ &\quad + \theta \bar{\theta} [g^2 (\rho \times C) \times \bar{C} - ig (\rho \times B)](x) \\ &\equiv \rho(x) + \theta (s_{ab} \rho(x)) + \bar{\theta} (s_b \rho(x)) + \theta \bar{\theta} (s_b s_{ab} \rho(x)), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where the superscript (g) on the superfields refers to the super expansions of the superfields obtained after the application of gauge invariant restrictions (12). Thus, we have already obtained the (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations for the fields ϕ_μ and ρ in view of the mappings: $s_b \longleftrightarrow \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} (\partial/\partial\bar{\theta})$, $s_{ab} \longleftrightarrow \lim_{\bar{\theta} \rightarrow 0} (\partial/\partial\theta)$.

Within the framework of superfield formalism, we can also calculate the (anti-)BRST transformations for the field strength tensor $G_{\mu\nu}$ and composite field $(F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho)$. With the inputs from Sec. III and Sec. IV, we have the following:

$$\tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^{(g,h)} = \partial_\mu \tilde{\phi}_\nu^{(g)} - g (\tilde{B}_\mu^{(h)} \times \tilde{\phi}_\nu^{(g)}) - \partial_\nu \tilde{\phi}_\mu^{(g)} + g (\tilde{B}_\nu^{(h)} \times \tilde{\phi}_\mu^{(g)}). \quad (16)$$

The substitution of expansions from (9) and (15) leads to the following expansion

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^{(g,h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= G_{\mu\nu}(x) + \theta [-g (G_{\mu\nu} \times \bar{C})] + \bar{\theta} [-g (G_{\mu\nu} \times C)](x) \\ &\quad + \theta \bar{\theta} [g^2 (G_{\mu\nu} \times C) \times \bar{C} - ig (G_{\mu\nu} \times B)](x), \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

which results in the following (anti-)BRST transformations for the tensor field $G_{\mu\nu}$, namely;

$$\begin{aligned} s_b G_{\mu\nu} &= -g (G_{\mu\nu} \times C), \quad s_{ab} G_{\mu\nu} = -g (G_{\mu\nu} \times \bar{C}), \\ s_b s_{ab} G_{\mu\nu} &= g^2 (G_{\mu\nu} \times C) \times \bar{C} - ig (G_{\mu\nu} \times B). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

It is also interesting to check explicitly that,

$$\tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^{(g,h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \cdot \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu(g,h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = G_{\mu\nu}(x) \cdot G^{\mu\nu}(x), \quad (19)$$

which establishes the Grassmannian independence of the l.h.s.. As a consequence, we infer from this observation that $(G_{\mu\nu} \cdot G^{\mu\nu})$ is an (anti-)BRST invariant quantity.

In an exactly similar fashion, it is straightforward to note that (cf. (10) and (15)):

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^{(h)} \times \tilde{\rho}^{(g)})(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= (F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho)(x) - \theta [g(F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times \bar{C}](x) - \bar{\theta} [g(F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times C](x) \\ &+ \theta \bar{\theta} [g^2 \{(F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times C\} \times \bar{C} - ig (F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times B](x). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The above expansion implies that the (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations of the composite field $(F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho)$ are as given below:

$$\begin{aligned} s_b(F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho) &= -g (F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times C, & s_{ab}(F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho) &= -g (F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times \bar{C}, \\ s_b s_{ab} (F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho) &= g^2 \{(F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times C\} \times \bar{C} - ig (F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times B. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Furthermore, it is elementary to show that

$$\left[\left\{ (\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^{(h)} \times \tilde{\rho}^{(g)})(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \right\} \cdot \left\{ (\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu(h)} \times \tilde{\rho}^{(g)})(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \right\} \right] = (F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho)(x) \cdot (F^{\mu\nu} \times \rho)(x), \quad (22)$$

which establishes the Grassmannian independence of the l.h.s.. As a consequence, we conclude that $(F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \cdot (F^{\mu\nu} \times \rho)$ is an (anti-)BRST invariant quantity (i.e. $s_{(a)b} [(F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \cdot (F^{\mu\nu} \times \rho)] = 0$). Before we close this section, it is interesting to note that

$$\tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^{(g,h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \cdot (\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu(h)} \times \tilde{\rho}^{(g)})(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = G_{\mu\nu}(x) \cdot (F^{\mu\nu} \times \rho)(x). \quad (23)$$

It verifies the Grassmannian independence of the l.h.s.. This observation, in turn, implies the (anti-)BRST invariance of $G_{\mu\nu} \cdot (F^{\mu\nu} \times \rho)$ (i.e. $s_{(a)b} [G_{\mu\nu} \cdot (F^{\mu\nu} \times \rho)] = 0$). Finally, it is clear that $\left(G^{\mu\nu} + g(F^{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \right) \cdot \left(G_{\mu\nu} + g(F_{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \right)$ of the Lagrangian density (1) is an (anti-)BRST invariant quantity. Furthermore, it is true to state that

$$\frac{m}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\eta} \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \cdot \tilde{\phi}_\eta^{(g)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = \frac{m}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\eta} F_{\mu\nu}(x) \cdot \phi_\eta(x), \quad (24)$$

which proves the (anti-)BRST invariance of the last term of $\mathcal{L}_0$ because the l.h.s. of (24) is actually independent of the Grassmannian variables.

V. COUPLED LAGRANGIAN DENSITIES: (ANTI-)BRST SYMMETRIES

In the previous section (cf. Sec. IV), we have derived the (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations for the relevant fields of the theory. This can be seen from a close look at equations (9), (10) and (15). In explicit form, these (anti-)BRST transformations are

$$\begin{aligned} s_{ab}A_\mu &= D_\mu\bar{C}, & s_{ab}\bar{C} &= \frac{g}{2}(\bar{C} \times \bar{C}), & s_{ab}B &= -g(B \times \bar{C}), & s_{ab}\rho &= -g(\rho \times \bar{C}), \\ s_{ab}\phi_\mu &= -g(\phi_\mu \times \bar{C}), & s_{ab}C &= i\bar{B}, & s_{ab}\bar{B} &= 0, & s_{ab}F_{\mu\nu} &= -g(F_{\mu\nu} \times \bar{C}), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

$$\begin{aligned} s_bA_\mu &= D_\mu C, & s_bC &= \frac{g}{2}(C \times C), & s_b\bar{B} &= -g(\bar{B} \times C), & s_b\rho &= -g(\rho \times C), \\ s_b\phi_\mu &= -g(\phi_\mu \times C), & s_b\bar{C} &= iB, & s_bB &= 0, & s_bF_{\mu\nu} &= -g(F_{\mu\nu} \times C). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

The above transformations are off-shell nilpotent of order two ($s_{a(b)}^2 = 0$) and absolutely anticommuting ($s_b s_{ab} + s_{ab} s_b = 0$) in nature.

The (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations for the Nakanishi-Lautrup type auxiliary fields ($B, \bar{B}$) have been obtained from the requirements of the nilpotency and absolute anticommutativity properties of $s_{(a)b}$. In fact, the above requirements lead to the following

$$s_b B = 0, \quad s_b \bar{B} = -g(\bar{B} \times C), \quad s_{ab} \bar{B} = 0, \quad s_{ab} B = -g(B \times \bar{C}). \quad (27)$$

The absolute anticommutativity of the (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations ($s_{(a)b}$), applied onto the following fields, namely;

$$\{s_b, s_{ab}\}A_\mu = 0, \quad \{s_b, s_{ab}\}\phi_\mu = 0, \quad \{s_b, s_{ab}\}\rho = 0, \quad (28)$$

is *true* only when CF-condition ($B + \bar{B} + ig(C \times \bar{C}) = 0$) is satisfied. Thus, we note that our superfield formalism leads to (i) the derivation of the off-shell nilpotent and absolutely anticommuting (anti-)BRST transformations, and (ii) the CF-condition. The latter defines a hypersurface in the 3D Minkowski spacetime manifold on which the proper (i.e. nilpotent and absolutely anticommuting) (anti-)BRST transformations are defined. Furthermore, it can be checked that the CF-condition is (anti-)BRST invariant (i.e. $s_{(a)b}[B + \bar{B} + ig(C \times \bar{C})] = 0$). In other words, the key results of our superfield formalism are the derivation of the proper (anti-)BRST transformations and (anti-)BRST invariant CF-condition.

The expressions for the coupled (anti-)BRST-invariant Lagrangian densities of the 3D massive non-Abelian gauge theory can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}_B = \mathcal{L}_0 + s_b s_{ab} \left[\frac{i}{2} A_\mu \cdot A^\mu + C \cdot \bar{C} + \frac{1}{2} \phi_\mu \cdot \phi^\mu \right],$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}} = \mathcal{L}_0 - s_{ab} s_b \left[\frac{i}{2} A_\mu \cdot A^\mu + C \cdot \bar{C} + \frac{1}{2} \phi_\mu \cdot \phi^\mu \right]. \quad (29)$$

It should be noted that the terms in the square brackets are chosen in such a way that each term has a mass dimension one and ghost number equal to zero. Furthermore, all these terms (in the bracket), are Lorentz scalar. This is due to the fact that nilpotent (anti-)BRST symmetries increase the mass dimension of fields by *one* on which they operate. As a consequence, we have the following expressions for the 3D (anti-)BRST invariant coupled (but equivalent) Lagrangian densities

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_B = & -\frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu} \cdot F_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4} (G^{\mu\nu} + gF^{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \cdot (G_{\mu\nu} + gF_{\mu\nu} \times \rho) + \frac{m}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\eta} F_{\mu\nu} \cdot \phi_\eta \\ & + B \cdot (\partial^\mu A_\mu) + \frac{1}{2} (B \cdot B + \bar{B} \cdot \bar{B}) - i \partial^\mu \bar{C} \cdot D_\mu C, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}} = & -\frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu} \cdot F_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4} (G^{\mu\nu} + gF^{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \cdot (G_{\mu\nu} + gF_{\mu\nu} \times \rho) + \frac{m}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\eta} F_{\mu\nu} \cdot \phi_\eta \\ & - \bar{B} \cdot (\partial^\mu A_\mu) + \frac{1}{2} (B \cdot B + \bar{B} \cdot \bar{B}) - i D^\mu \bar{C} \cdot \partial_\mu C. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

We note that there are no gauge-fixing and Faddeev-Popov ghost terms for the vector field ϕ_μ in the Lagrangian densities (30) and (31). The reason, behind this observation, is that the field ϕ_μ transforms covariantly (i.e. $s_b \phi_\mu = -g (\phi_\mu \times C)$, $s_{ab} \phi_\mu = -g (\phi_\mu \times \bar{C})$) under the (anti-)BRST transformations (cf. (25), (26)). Thus, the term $(\phi_\mu \cdot \phi^\mu)$ remains invariant under the (anti-)BRST transformations and, as a consequence, there is no contribution from this term to the (anti-)BRST invariant Lagrangian densities.

It can be checked that the above Lagrangian densities $\mathcal{L}_B$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$ transform, under the off-shell nilpotent (anti-)BRST transformations, as

$$\begin{aligned} s_b \mathcal{L}_B &= \partial_\mu [B \cdot (D^\mu C)], \quad s_{ab} \mathcal{L}_B = \partial_\mu (B \cdot \partial^\mu \bar{C}) - D_\mu [B + \bar{B} + i(C \times \bar{C})] \cdot \partial^\mu \bar{C}, \\ s_{ab} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}} &= -\partial_\mu [\bar{B} \cdot (D^\mu \bar{C})], \quad s_b \mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}} = -\partial_\mu (\bar{B} \cdot \partial^\mu C) + D_\mu [B + \bar{B} + i(C \times \bar{C})] \cdot \partial^\mu C. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Thus, the corresponding actions (i.e. $\int d^3x \mathcal{L}_B$ and $\int d^3x \mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$) remain invariant on the constrained surface in the 3D spacetime manifold where the CF-condition is satisfied. The explicit expressions in (32) explain that $\mathcal{L}_B$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$ are equivalent and both of them respect the nilpotent (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations.

VI. CONSERVED CHARGES: NOVEL FEATURES

The invariance of the Lagrangian density (or action), under any arbitrary continuous symmetry transformation, leads to the derivation of the conserved current according to the Noether's theorem. As a consequence, the off-shell nilpotent (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations ($s_{(a)b}$) lead to the derivation of the following Noether's conserved currents $J_{(a)b}^\mu$,

$$\begin{aligned} J_b^\mu &= B \cdot (D^\mu C) - [F^{\mu\nu} - g((G^{\mu\nu} + gF^{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times \rho) - m \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\eta} \phi_\eta] \cdot (D_\nu C) \\ &+ g[G^{\mu\nu} + g(F^{\mu\nu} \times \rho)] \cdot (\phi_\nu \times C) + \frac{i}{2} g \partial^\mu \bar{C} \cdot (C \times C), \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

$$\begin{aligned} J_{ab}^\mu &= -\bar{B} \cdot (D^\mu \bar{C}) - [F^{\mu\nu} - g((G^{\mu\nu} + gF^{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times \rho) - m \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\eta} \phi_\eta] \cdot (D_\nu \bar{C}) \\ &+ g[G^{\mu\nu} + g(F^{\mu\nu} \times \rho)] \cdot (\phi_\nu \times \bar{C}) - \frac{i}{2} g \partial^\mu C \cdot (\bar{C} \times \bar{C}). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

The above expressions for the Noether's currents can be re-expressed (for the algebraic convenience), in the following form

$$\begin{aligned} J_b^\mu &= B \cdot (D^\mu C) - \partial^\mu B \cdot C - \frac{i}{2} g \partial^\mu \bar{C} \cdot (C \times C) \\ &- \partial_\nu [(F^{\mu\nu} - g\{(G^{\mu\nu} + gF^{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times \rho\} - m \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\eta} \phi_\eta) \cdot C], \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

$$\begin{aligned} J_{ab}^\mu &= -\bar{B} \cdot (D^\mu \bar{C}) + \partial^\mu \bar{B} \cdot \bar{C} + \frac{i}{2} g \partial^\mu C \cdot (\bar{C} \times \bar{C}) \\ &- \partial_\nu [(F^{\mu\nu} - g\{(G^{\mu\nu} + gF^{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times \rho\} - m \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\eta} \phi_\eta) \cdot \bar{C}]. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Now the proof of conservation law ($\partial_\mu J_{(a)b}^\mu = 0$) becomes easier and it can be confirmed by exploiting the following Euler-Lagrange equations of motion, derived from the Lagrangian densities $\mathcal{L}_B$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$, respectively, namely;

$$\begin{aligned} D_\mu F^{\mu\nu} - g D_\mu [(G^{\mu\nu} + gF^{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times \rho] + m \varepsilon^{\mu\eta\nu} D_\mu \phi_\eta - \partial^\nu B \\ + g[(G^{\mu\nu} + gF^{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times \phi_\mu] - i g (\partial^\nu \bar{C} \times C) &= 0, \\ D_\mu [G^{\mu\nu} + g(F^{\mu\nu} \times \rho)] + \frac{m}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\eta\nu} F_{\mu\eta} &= 0, \\ (G^{\mu\nu} + gF^{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times F_{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad \partial_\mu (D^\mu C) = 0, \quad D_\mu (\partial^\mu \bar{C}) &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

$$\begin{aligned} D_\mu F^{\mu\nu} - g D_\mu [(G^{\mu\nu} + gF^{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times \rho] + m \varepsilon^{\mu\eta\nu} D_\mu \phi_\eta + \partial^\nu \bar{B} \\ + g[(G^{\mu\nu} + gF^{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times \phi_\mu] + i g (\bar{C} \times \partial^\nu C) &= 0, \\ D_\mu [G^{\mu\nu} + g(F^{\mu\nu} \times \rho)] + \frac{m}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\eta\nu} F_{\mu\eta} &= 0, \\ (G^{\mu\nu} + gF^{\mu\nu} \times \rho) \times F_{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad \partial_\mu (D^\mu \bar{C}) = 0, \quad D_\mu (\partial^\mu C) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

The above conserved currents (cf. (35), (36)) lead to the derivation of the following conserved (anti-)BRST charges ($Q_{(a)b} = \int d^2x J_{(a)b}^0$), namely;

$$Q_{ab} = - \int d^2x [\bar{B} \cdot D^0 \bar{C} - \dot{\bar{B}} \cdot \bar{C} - \frac{i}{2} g \dot{C} \cdot (\bar{C} \times \bar{C})], \quad (39)$$

$$Q_b = \int d^2x [B \cdot D^0 C - \dot{B} \cdot C - \frac{i}{2} g \dot{C} \cdot (C \times C)]. \quad (40)$$

The conserved ($\dot{Q}_{(a)b} = 0$) and nilpotent (i.e. $Q_{(a)b}^2 = 0$) (anti-)BRST charges $Q_{(a)b}$ are the generators of the symmetry transformations (25) and (26), respectively. For instance, it can be checked that $s_r \Phi = \pm i [\Phi, Q_r]_{\pm}$ ($r = b, ab$). Here the field Φ is the generic field of the theory and $(\pm)$ signs on the square bracket stand for the (anti)commutator for the generic field Φ of the theory being (fermionic)bosonic in nature.

It is interesting to point out that the nilpotent generators $Q_{(a)b}$, even though produce the nilpotent (anti-)BRST transformations for the basic fields, they are *unable* to generate the (anti-)BRST transformations for the auxiliary field ρ of the theory. Even the requirements of the nilpotency and absolutely anticommuting properties of the (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations do not generate the (anti-)BRST transformations for the auxiliary field ρ . This is a novel observation in this theory (within the framework of BRST formalism). For the usual 4D (non)-Abelian 1-form gauge theory, there are two inputs that lead to the derivation of *all* the (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations of *all* the relevant fields of the specific theory. These are (i) the (anti-)BRST charges $Q_{(a)b}$ as the generators of the nilpotent (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations, and (ii) the requirements of nilpotency and absolute anticommutativity which lead to the derivation of the (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations for the auxiliary fields of the theory. Thus, the field ρ is special.

VII. GHOST CHARGE: BRST ALGEBRA

The Lagrangian densities (30) and (31) remain invariant under the following scale transformations for the (anti-)ghost and other basic as well as auxiliary fields, namely;

$$C \rightarrow e^{+\Sigma} C, \quad \bar{C} \rightarrow e^{-\Sigma} \bar{C}, \quad (A_\mu, \phi_\mu, \rho, B, \bar{B}) \rightarrow e^0(A_\mu, \phi_\mu, \rho, B, \bar{B}), \quad (41)$$

where Σ is a global infinitesimal scale parameter. The $(+)-$ signs, in the exponents, represent the ghost number of the fields $(C)\bar{C}$ and the ghost number for the rest of the fields

(i.e. $A_\mu, \phi_\mu, \rho, B, \bar{B}$) is equal to zero. As a consequence, the latter fields do not transform at all under the ghost-scale transformations. It is straightforward to check that the following infinitesimal transformations (s_g), obtained from (41), namely;

$$s_g C = +\Sigma C, \quad s_g \bar{C} = -\Sigma \bar{C}, \quad s_g(A_\mu, \phi_\mu, \rho, B, \bar{B}) = 0, \quad (42)$$

are the *symmetry* transformations for the Lagrangian densities (30) and (31) because it is straightforward to check that $s_g \mathcal{L}_B = 0 = s_g \mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$.

The above ghost symmetry transformations s_g lead to the derivation of Noether's conserved current and charge as given below:

$$J_g^\mu = i \left[\bar{C} \cdot D^\mu C - \partial^\mu \bar{C} \cdot C \right], \quad Q_g = i \int d^2x \left[\bar{C} \cdot D^0 C - \dot{\bar{C}} \cdot C \right]. \quad (43)$$

It can be proven that the above ghost charge Q_g is the generator of (42). The (anti-)BRST charge ($Q_{(a)b}$) and the ghost charge Q_g satisfy the following standard BRST algebra, namely;

$$\begin{aligned} Q_b^2 = 0, \quad Q_{ab}^2 = 0, \quad i [Q_g, Q_b] = Q_b, \quad i [Q_g, Q_{ab}] = -Q_{ab}, \\ \{Q_b, Q_{ab}\} = Q_b Q_{ab} + Q_{ab} Q_b = 0, \quad Q_g^2 \neq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

which shows that the ghost number of BRST charge is (+1) and that of the anti-BRST charge is (-1). The above statements about the ghost numbers can be checked explicitly by starting with a state $|\psi\rangle_n$ that has the ghost number equal to n (i.e. $iQ_g|\psi\rangle_n = n|\psi\rangle_n$). With this input and the above algebra (44), we can check that the ghost numbers of states $Q_b|\psi\rangle_n$ and $Q_{ab}|\psi\rangle_n$ are $(n+1)$ and $(n-1)$, respectively. Thus, the BRST charge increases the ghost number by one when it operates on a quantum state. On the other hand, the anti-BRST charge decreases the above number by one.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

In our present investigation, we have exploited the *usual* classical Yang-Mills symmetry of the JP model of 3D massive non-Abelian gauge theory and generalized it to the (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations at the quantum level that are off-shell nilpotent and absolutely anticommuting in nature. In this endeavor, the ‘‘augmented’’ superfield formalism (where the HC and GIRs blend together beautifully) has played a decisive role because it leads to the derivation of a full set of proper (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations that satisfy the key requirements of the basic tenets of BRST formalism [18–22].

One of the important features of our superfield formulation is the derivation of the CF condition that enables us to obtain the absolutely anticommuting (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations. Thus, in addition to the BRST symmetry for the JP model [17], we have been able to derive the *proper* anti-BRST symmetry transformations for this model. Furthermore, the celebrated CF condition has been able to help us in driving the coupled Lagrangian densities (cf. (30), (31)) that respect the proper (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations.

To obtain the full set of proper (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations, we are theoretically compelled to go beyond the HC and exploit the suitable GIRs to deduce the appropriate set of (anti-)BRST symmetries. This is a novel feature of this model. Furthermore, as it turns out, the auxiliary field ρ is *not* like the other auxiliary (e.g. Nakanishi-Lautrup) fields of the theory because its (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations do *not* arise from the requirements of the nilpotency and absolute anticommutativity of the (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations. This observation is *also* a novel feature of our present theory. The good thing about our superfield formalism is that it leads to the derivation of the correct (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations associated with this *special* auxiliary field ρ .

The 3D JP model is somewhat special. Unlike the parity violating mass term that is generated by the incorporation of the Chern-Simons term, the JP model generates the mass term with even parity. Furthermore, this model does not take any recourse to the higher p -form ($p = 2, 3, 4, \dots$) gauge potentials for the mass generation as happens in the case of 4D topologically massive gauge theories. This is an important component of the JP model because, so far, there is no experimental evidence for the existence of the higher p -form gauge potentials. It is these beautiful features (associated with the JP model) that have propelled us to study it within the frameworks of superfield and BRST formalisms.

In our present endeavor, we have purposely concentrated *only* on the usual YM gauge symmetries for the BRST analysis within the framework of the superfield formalism. This is due to the fact that we plan to understand the JP model step-by-step so that we can gain deep insights into the key aspects of this model. This understanding, perhaps, would enable us to propose an accurate model for the 4D theory and would make us confident about the limiting cases of the general BRST analysis of this 3D model where YM and NYM gauge symmetries would be combined together for the superfield formalism. We have already taken some modest theoretical steps in this direction and our results are encouraging.

It would be very nice endeavor to exploit the NYM gauge transformations (3) within

the framework of our superfield formalism and obtain the new results connected with the nilpotent (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations that emerge from it. Furthermore, it would be exciting to take the combination of the YM and NYM gauge transformations *together* and obtain the full set of proper (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations, relevant coupled Lagrangian densities and exact (anti-)BRST charges that generate the proper (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations for the 3D JP model. We are, at present, devoting time on these issues and our results would be reported in our future publications [25].

Acknowledgments: SG and RK would like to gratefully acknowledge the financial support from CSIR and UGC, New Delhi, Government of India, respectively.

IX. APPENDIX

The nilpotency and anticommutativity of the (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations and corresponding generators can be proven, in a simple and elegant manner, by exploiting the potential and power of our superfield formalism. As has been pointed out earlier, it can be checked from the expansions in (9) and (15), that

$$\begin{aligned} s_b \Psi(x) &= \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \tilde{\Psi}^{(g,h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}), & s_{ab} \Psi(x) &= \lim_{\bar{\theta} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}} \tilde{\Psi}^{(g,h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}), \\ s_b s_{ab} \Psi(x) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}} \tilde{\Psi}^{(g,h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}), \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where $\Psi(x)$ is the generic local 4D field of the theory and $\tilde{\Psi}^{(g,h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta})$ are the corresponding superfields defined on the $(3, 2)$ -dimensional supermanifold and expanded after application of HC and GIRs. As a consequence, it is clear that the nilpotency of the (anti-)BRST transformations is captured in the nilpotency (i.e. $\partial_\theta^2 = 0$, $\partial_{\bar{\theta}}^2 = 0$) of the Grassmannian derivatives $(\partial_\theta, \partial_{\bar{\theta}})$. In an exactly similar fashion, it can be checked that

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \right) \tilde{\Psi}^{(g,h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = 0, \quad (46)$$

which encodes the absolute anticommutativity $(s_b s_{ab} + s_{ab} s_b) = 0$ of the (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations in 3D spacetime for the JP model of the massive gauge theory.

That the (anti-)BRST charges are also nilpotent of order two, can be captured in the following expressions within the framework of superfield formalism, namely;

$$Q_b = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \int d^2x \left[B(x) \cdot \tilde{B}_0^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) + i \dot{\tilde{F}}^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \cdot \tilde{F}^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \right]$$

$$\equiv \int d^2x \int d\bar{\theta} \left[B(x) \cdot \tilde{B}_0^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) + i \dot{\tilde{F}}^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \cdot \tilde{F}^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \right]. \quad (47)$$

Written in the ordinary 3D spacetime, the above expressions imply:

$$Q_b = \int d^2x s_b \left[B(x) \cdot A_0(x) + i \dot{\tilde{C}}(x) \cdot C(x) \right]. \quad (48)$$

As a consequence, it is clear that $s_b Q_b = -i\{Q_b, Q_b\} = 0$ because of the nilpotency of the BRST transformations (s_b). In the language of the superfield and superspace variables:

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} Q_b = 0 \implies Q_b^2 = 0. \quad (49)$$

There is an alternative way to express the BRST charge that is valid only on the constrained surface in the 3D spacetime manifold where the CF-condition ($B + \bar{B} + ig(C \times \bar{C}) = 0$) is satisfied. This is given, within the framework of superfield formalism, as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_b &= i \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}} \int d^2x \left[\tilde{B}_0^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \cdot \tilde{F}^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \right] \\ &\equiv \int d^2x s_b s_{ab} \left(i A_0(x) \cdot C(x) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

The nilpotency of the BRST charge is, once again, proven by the nilpotency of the Grassmannian derivative $\partial_{\bar{\theta}}$ (i.e. $\partial_{\bar{\theta}}^2 = 0$) and the off-shell nilpotency ($s_b^2 = 0$) of the BRST transformations s_b . Thus, we ultimately note that the nilpotency of BRST charge is encoded in $\partial_{\bar{\theta}}^2 = 0$ and $s_b^2 = 0$ when it is expressed in terms of the Grassmannian derivative $\partial_{\bar{\theta}}$ on the (3, 2)-dimensional supermanifold and/or in terms of the BRST transformations s_b in the 3D ordinary spacetime.

As we have expressed the BRST charge Q_b in terms of the superfields (obtained after the application of HC and GIRs), similarly, we can express the anti-BRST charge Q_{ab} in the following two different ways, namely;

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{ab} &= \lim_{\bar{\theta} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \int d^2x \left[\bar{B}(x) \cdot \tilde{B}_0^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) + i \dot{\tilde{F}}^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \cdot \tilde{\bar{F}}^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \right], \\ Q_{ab} &= -i \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}} \int d^2x \left[\tilde{B}_0^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \cdot \tilde{\bar{F}}^{(h)}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where the second expression is true only on the 3D constrained surface where the CF field equation ($B + \bar{B} + ig(C \times \bar{C}) = 0$) is satisfied. The nilpotency ($\partial_{\bar{\theta}}^2 = 0$) of the Grassmannian derivative $\partial_{\bar{\theta}}$ ensures that $Q_{ab}^2 = 0$ because it can be seen that $\partial_{\bar{\theta}} Q_{ab} = 0$. The above

expression can also be expressed in the 3D ordinary space as given below

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{ab} &= \int d^2x s_{ab} \left[\bar{B}(x) \cdot A_0(x) + i \dot{C}(x) \cdot \bar{C}(x) \right] \\ &\equiv i \int d^2x \left[s_{ab} s_b \left(A_0(x) \cdot \bar{C}(x) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

The nilpotency of Q_{ab} is captured in the equation $s_{ab}Q_{ab} = -i\{Q_{ab}, Q_{ab}\} = 0$ because we know, from the anti-BRST symmetry transformations (25), that $s_{ab}^2 = 0$.

The (anti-)BRST invariance as well as the equivalence of the coupled Lagrangian densities can also be captured in the language of the superfield formalism. To this end in mind, it can be checked that the starting Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}_0$ can be generalized onto the $(3, 2)$ -dimensional supermanifold as illustrated below

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0 \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_0 &= -\frac{1}{4} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu(h)} \cdot \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^{(h)} - \frac{1}{4} (\tilde{G}^{\mu\nu(g,h)} + g \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu(h)} \times \tilde{\rho}^{(g)}) \cdot (\tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^{(g,h)} + g \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^{(g,h)} \times \tilde{\rho}^{(g)}) \\ &\quad + \frac{m}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\eta} \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^{(h)} \cdot \tilde{\phi}_\eta^{(h)}. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

The above expression for $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_0$, however, turns out to be actually independent of the Grassmannian variables because of our discussions in Sec. III and Sec. IV. As a consequence, it can be stated that

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_0 = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_0 = 0 \iff s_{(a)b} \mathcal{L}_0 = 0. \quad (54)$$

Thus, we conclude that the above equation captures the (anti-)BRST invariance of the starting Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}_0$ within the framework of superfield formalism.

The (anti-)BRST invariant coupled Lagrangian densities can be generalized onto the $(3, 2)$ -dimensional supermanifold as given below:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}} \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\bar{B}} &= \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_0 - \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}} \left[\frac{i}{2} \tilde{B}_\mu^{(h)} \cdot \tilde{B}^{\mu(h)} + \tilde{F}^{(h)} \cdot \tilde{\bar{F}}^{(h)} + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\phi}_\mu^{(g)} \cdot \tilde{\phi}^{\mu(g)} \right], \\ \mathcal{L}_B \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_B &= \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_0 + \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left[\frac{i}{2} \tilde{B}_\mu^{(h)} \cdot \tilde{B}^{\mu(h)} + \tilde{F}^{(h)} \cdot \tilde{\bar{F}}^{(h)} + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\phi}_\mu^{(g)} \cdot \tilde{\phi}^{\mu(g)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

The nilpotency ($\partial_\theta^2 = \partial_{\bar{\theta}}^2 = 0$) of the Grassmannian derivatives ($\partial_\theta, \partial_{\bar{\theta}}$) and the Grassmannian independence of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_0$, lead to the following:

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_B = 0 \iff s_b \mathcal{L}_B = 0, \quad \lim_{\bar{\theta} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\bar{B}} = 0 \iff s_{ab} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}} = 0. \quad (56)$$

The equivalence of the coupled Lagrangian densities $\mathcal{L}_B$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$ can also be captured within the framework of our superfield formalism. In fact, we can readily provide the proof that

$\lim_{\bar{\theta} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_B = 0$, $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\bar{B}} = 0$ because of the nilpotency ($\partial_{\bar{\theta}}^2 = 0, \partial_{\theta}^2 = 0$) and anticommutativity of the Grassmannian derivatives (i.e. $\partial_{\theta} \partial_{\bar{\theta}} + \partial_{\bar{\theta}} \partial_{\theta} = 0$).

- [1] D. Z. Freedman, P. K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. B **177** (1981) 282.
- [2] T. J. Allen, M. J. Bowick, A. Lahiri, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **6** (1991) 559.
- [3] A. Lahiri, Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001) 105002.
- [4] E. Harikumar, A. Lahiri, M. Sivakumar, Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001) 491.
- [5] Saurabh Gupta, R. P. Malik, Eur. Phys. J. C **58** (2008) 517, arXiv:0807.2306 [hep-th].
- [6] S. Gupta, R. Kumar, R. P. Malik, Eur. Phys. J. C **65** (2010) 311, arXiv:0905.0934 [hep-th].
- [7] S. Gupta, R. Kumar, R. P. Malik, Eur. Phys. J. C **70** (2010) 491, arXiv:1003.3390 [hep-th].
- [8] R. Kumar, R. P. Malik, Eur. Phys. Lett. **94** (2011) 11001, arXiv:1012.5195 [hep-th].
- [9] R. Kumar, R. P. Malik, Eur. Phys. J. C **71** (2011) 1710, arXiv:1104.1340 [hep-th] .
- [10] S. Krishna, A. Shukla, R. P. Malik, arXiv:1104.1340 [hep-th].
- [11] R. Jackiw, S. -Y. Pi, Phys. Lett. B **403** (1997) 297.
- [12] S. Deser, R. Jackiw, S. Templeton, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48** (1982) 975.
- [13] S. Deser, R. Jackiw, S. Templeton, Ann. Phys. (NY) **140** (1982) 372.
- [14] J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. **125** (1962) 397.
- [15] J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. **128** (1962) 2425.
- [16] Ö. F. Dayi, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **13** (1998) 1969, arXiv:hep-th/9711079.
- [17] O. M. Del Cima, arXiv:1104.0164 [hep-th].
- [18] L. Bonora, M. Tonin, Phys. Lett. B **98** (1981) 48.
- [19] L. Bonora, P. Pasti, M. Tonin, Nuovo Cimento A **63** (1981) 353.
- [20] R. P. Malik, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **40** (2007) 4877, arXiv:hep-th/0605213.
- [21] R. P. Malik, Eur. Phys. J. C **51** (2007) 169, arXiv:hep-th/0603049.
- [22] R. P. Malik, Eur. Phys. J. C **47** (2006) 227, arXiv:hep-th/0507127.
- [23] G. Curci, R. Ferrari, Phys. Lett. B **63** (1976) 91.
- [24] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields: Modern Applications*
Vol. II (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996).
- [25] S. Gupta, R. Kumar, R. P. Malik, in preparation.